

1 Vaughn R Walker
2 Law Office of Vaughn R Walker
3 Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 2200
4 San Francisco, CA 94111
5 Tel: (415) 871-2888
6 Fax: (415) 871-2890
7 vrw@judgewalker.com

8

9

10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12
13 IN RE CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT) ANTITRUST
14 LITIGATION

MDL No 1917

This Order Relates To:

Case No 3:07-cv-05944 JST

15 ALL ACTIONS

16 ORDER RE NEUTRAL TRANSLATORS FOR
17 TRANSLATION OBJECTIONS

1 On April 25 and May 3, 2016, the undersigned issued orders regarding a
2 Translation-Objection Resolution Protocol (ECF Nos 4597, 4625). The May 3 order specified:

3 No later than May 13, 2016, the parties shall submit either separate lists as
4 currently specified in the April 25, 2016 order, or a jointly agreed-upon list of
translators.

5 On May 23, 2016, having received no timely objection, the court issued its order
6 adopting the undersigned's orders dated April 25 and May 3, 2016. 5/23/16 Order, ECF No
7 4657.

8 On May 13, 2016, the parties provided the names of three proposed translators
9 as required by the May 3 order, explaining that they were meeting and conferring on "a
10 protocol for ensuring that no conflicts of interest exist at present or will exist in the future with
11 respect to these agreed-upon translators." 5/13/16 C Benson Letter (on behalf of Direct Action
12 Plaintiffs, Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs and Defendants).

13 On May 20, 2016, the parties wrote to inform the undersigned that they were
14 working on a procedure "to ensure neutrality of these translators" and expect to submit a
15 proposed protocol for the undersigned's review and consideration no later than May 27, 2016.
16 If they couldn't agree, they would submit separate lists of proposed neutral translators as
17 specified in the May 3 order. 5/20/16 C Benson Letter (on behalf of all parties).

18 On May 31, 2016, the parties notified the undersigned that they "continue to
19 confer over an appropriate protocol to ensure the neutrality of appointed translators" and "will
be back in touch with Judge Walker on the issue shortly." 5/31/16 D Andrews email (on behalf
21 of all parties).

22 It is now June 21, 2016, and the parties have failed to submit a proposed
23 protocol "to ensure neutrality" by May 27, 2016 as they expected. It should be noted that the
24 court granted the plaintiffs' motion to establish a translation-objection resolution protocol on
25 March 23, 2016 and referred the matter to the undersigned. ECF No 4517. Given the passage

1 of time and the parties' inability to reach timely agreement, it appears necessary to set another
2 deadline.

3 Accordingly, no later than June 27, 2016, the parties shall submit: (a) their
4 proposed protocol for ensuring neutrality of the three proposed translators or (b) their
5 separate lists of proposed neutral translators as specified in the May 3 order. In the event the
6 parties fail to submit their proposed protocol or separate lists by June 27, the undersigned will
7 begin the process of identifying and selecting neutral translators.

8

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Date: June 21, 2016



11
12 Vaughn R Walker
13 United States District Judge (Ret)

14
15 The Recommended Order of the Special Master is Accepted and Ordered / Denied / Modified.

16 Date: _____

17
18 Honorable Jon S Tigar
19 United States District Judge

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 ORDER RE NEUTRAL TRANSLATORS FOR TRANSLATION OBJECTIONS PAGE 3 OF 3